

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present amendments in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

After entry of this amendment, Claims 1, 4-8 and 10-12 are pending. Claims 1 and 8 are amended, and Claims 2 and 9 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is introduced.¹

By way of summary, the Office Action of June 10, 2010 presents the following issues: Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (JP 2001-022499) in view of Satoshi (JP 2004-157677); and Claims 6-7 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Sigalov (U.S. Patent No. 5,017,770).

With respect to the rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 8-10 as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Satoshi, Claim 1 is amended to recite, *inter alia*, a forced feedback apparatus that includes nozzles arranged,

in equilateral triangles in the jetting unit, and when the receiver has a concave shape of a diameter D, intervals for placing each of the nozzles in the jetting unit are set such that at least one nozzle exists within a region having a diameter of $0.8 \times D$ to exert an even pressure on the receiver at nozzle transitions...(Emphasis added.)

The primary reference, Suzuki, generally describes an image display terminal that displays a virtual object in virtual space based on the state of a virtual air blasting receiving object.² Suzuki illustrates multiple air blasting discharge means (2) arranged in front of an operator (3) who is holding blast reception means (5) in his or her hands.³ In operation, Suzuki describes that the air blasting discharge means (2) generates wind (4) directed towards

¹ Non-limiting support for the amended claims may be found at least in Figures 9A-9B and the associated discussion on pages 22-24 of the specification as originally filed.

² Suzuki at paragraph [0005].

³ See Figure 1B of Suzuki and also paragraphs [0010]-[0012].

the operator (3) and the blast reception means (5), and that an air blasting received section (6) detects the position of the blast reception means (5) as well as their direction of travel.⁴ A virtual contact calculating means (8) calculates the virtual contact state of both the virtual space (1a) and the virtual object (1b), and an air blasting discharge calculating means (9) calculates the position of the wind (4) which the air blasting discharge means (2) emits based on the result calculated by the virtual contact calculating means (8).⁵

However, Suzuki does not describe that the air blasting discharge means (2) are positioned to exert a constant pressure on the blast reception means (5) as the blast reception means (5) transitions from wind (4) generated by one air blasting discharge means (2) to wind (4) generated by another air blasting discharge means (2). Instead, Suzuki only describes that the air blasting discharge calculating means (9) calculates a pressure and direction of the wind (4) based on the relationship of the virtual object (1b) to the operator (3) in the virtual space (1a).⁶ In other words, Suzuki merely describes control of the direction and strength of the wind (4) generated by the air blasting discharge means (2). Nowhere does Suzuki describe the position of the air blasting discharge means (2) relative to the blast reception means (2), much less that the air blasting discharge means (2) are positioned to maintain a constant pressure as the blast reception means (5) transition from wind from one air blasting discharge means (2) to another. Conversely, amended Claim 1 recites placing each of the nozzles in the jetting unit such that at least one nozzle exists within a region having a diameter of $0.8 \times D$ to exert an even pressure on the receiver at nozzle transitions. Therefore, Suzuki fails to disclose the claimed nozzle positions and Satoshi does not cure this deficiency in Suzuki. Accordingly, no combination of Suzuki and Satoshi describe every feature recited in amended Claim 1, and amended Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance together with any claim depending therefrom.

⁴ Suzuki at paragraphs [0011]-[0013].

⁵ Suzuki at paragraphs [0015]-[0016]; see also Figure 1A.

⁶ Suzuki at paragraphs [0014]-[0017].

Moreover, Claim 8 recites features substantially similar to those recited in amended Claim 1, and is believed to be in condition for allowance, together with any claim depending therefrom, for substantially similar reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

As all other rejections of record rely upon Suzuki for describing the above-distinguished features, and the above-distinguished features are not disclosed or suggested by Suzuki, alone or in combination with any other art of record, it is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 6-7 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

For the reasons discussed above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1, 4-8 and 10-12 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 08/09)



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Aldo Martinez
Registration No. 61,357